

**Remarks**

The Office action mailed February 18, 2009, has been reviewed and carefully considered. The rejections are traversed for the reasons set forth below.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

Claims 1-22, 24-38, 40, 41, 48, 50-53, 55-57, 63 and 64 have been rejected for alleged obviousness in view of Ohama (2001/0031669) combined with Josef et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,560,573) (Blazejak is the first named inventor in the '573 patent but Josef et al. is used in this response to maintain consistency with the Office action text). The examiner recognizes that Ohama does not disclose a golf ball core that includes non-metal salts of an organic sulfur compound as presently recited in claim 1, and thus relies upon the disclosure of Josef et al. In particular, the Office action on page 2 states that Josef et al. teaches the use of ammonium salts of pentachlorothiophenol and that pentachlorothiophenol is commonly used in the rubber industry for mastication. It is respectfully submitted that Josef et al. does not, in fact, teach ammonium salts of pentachlorothiophenol.

Josef et al. discloses a method for producing purified pentachlorothiophenol that involves inducing precipitation of pentachlorothiophenol from an aqueous solution by the addition of an ammonium salt to the solution. There is no mention that an ammonium salt of pentachlorothiophenol is formed. Indeed, the analysis of the pentachlorothiophenol produced in Example 1 indicates that there was no nitrogen present in the end product.

Since Josef et al. does not even teach ammonium salts of pentachlorothiophenol, it certainly would not have provided any reason for adding an ammonium salt of pentachlorothiophenol to a golf ball core composition. An ammonium salt is used in Josef et al. simply as a precipitating agent. There is no suggestion that the ammonium salt is itself a desirable end product for any purpose, much less as an additive for a golf ball core composition. Accordingly, the purported combination of Ohama and Josef et al. would not have rendered claims 1-22, 24-38, 40, 41, 48, 50-53, 55-57, 63 and 64 obvious.

Claims 23 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Ohama (2001/0031669) combined with Josef et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,560,573) and further in view of Sullivan (2001/0000506). Sullivan is relied upon simply for allegedly disclosing a wound layer, and thus does not compensate for the above-discussed deficiencies in the combination of Ohama and Josef et al. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 23 and 39 must also be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any questions regarding this application, Examiner Trimiew is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 595-5300  
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By /Wayne W. Rupert/  
Wayne W. Rupert  
Registration No. 34,420